

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

|   |   |                                    |
|---|---|------------------------------------|
| ERIC MESI and BETTY MESI,                   | ) | 3:16-cv-00065-RCJ-WGC              |
|   | ) |                                    |
| Plaintiffs,                                 | ) | <b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b> |
|   | ) |                                    |
| vs.   | ) | June 27, 2017                      |
|   | ) |                                    |
| SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, <i>et al.</i> , | ) |                                    |
|   | ) |                                    |
| Defendants.                                 | ) |                                    |
|   | ) |                                    |

---

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Before the court is a letter from Plaintiff Eric Mesi requesting the court “keep [his] new address redacted . . .” (ECF No. 19.) Plaintiff’s letter is an *ex parte* communication which is prohibited (except under certain circumstances, none of which is applicable). *See*, LR IA 7-2(b).

To the extent Plaintiff’s request is an authorized submission, the request is denied. LR IA 10-2 requires a party’s name, address, phone number and email address to be provided on every filing. Mr. Mesi presents no legitimate reason why the court should not follow LR IA 10-2.

LR 26-8 prohibits discovery from being filed with the court. Discovery responses are to be served on the party making the discovery request. If Plaintiff’s address were to be redacted, Defendants could not serve discovery upon Plaintiffs nor could Defendants know where to serve any responses to discovery which Plaintiffs might initiate.

///

///

Page Two

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/  
Deputy Clerk